SINGLE BENCH CF Rs 100/-

(1) (4)

IN THE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION [S] NO. 1039 /2007 [S.B.]

PETITIONER :- Smt. Savitri Bai wife of Uttam, aged about 22 years, resident of village Kunwa, Tahsil Sahaspur Lohara, District Kabirdham [C.G.].

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS :- 1] The State of Chhattisgarh, through the Secretary, Department of Mahila Avam Bal Vikas Vibhag, C.G. Raipur.

C.R. No. 1325/07 Presented by Shri ... Dt. 14-02-2007

2] The Collector/Additional Collector, Kabirdham [C.G.].

3] The Chief Executive Officer, Janpad Panchayat Sahaspur Lohara, District Kabirdham [C.G.].

RECEIVED COPY 14/2/07 CLERK to A. G. BILASPUR

4] The Project Officer, Mahila Avam Bal Vikas, Sahaspur Lohara, District Kabirdham [C.G.].

5] Smt. Yashoda Bai wife of not know, aged about 25 years, Resident of village- Kunwa, Tahsil Sahaspur Lohara, District Kabirdham [C.G.].

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA

(33)

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

Writ Petition (S) No. 1039 of 2007

Petitioner Smt. Savitri Bai

Versus

Respondents The State of Chhattisgarh & others

Single Bench: Hon'ble Mr. Justice **Satish K. Agnihotri.**

Present: Mr. M.K. Bhaduri, Advocate for the petitioner.
Ms. Deepali Pandey, Panel Lawyer for the State.

O R D E R

(Passed on 23rd Day of February, 2007)

The following order of the Court was passed by **Satish K. Agnihotri, J.**

1. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was appointed as Aanganbadi Worker at Aanganbadi Centre Kunwa, Tahsil-Sahaspur Lohara, District-Kabirdham vide order dated 8-11-2007 (Annexure P-1).

2. The respondent No. 5 challenged the appointment of the petitioner on the ground that the family of the respondent No. 5 is living below the poverty line and the petitioner is not below the poverty line and her father is also a Government Servant.

3. Under the Aanganbadi Scheme no candidate will be appointed whose near relative is Government Servant or Office bearer of Panchayat/Municipal. The preference should be given to those woman candidates who are living below the poverty line.

4. It is admitted case of the petitioner that the father of the petitioner is a Government Servant and she does not live below the poverty line, on the contrary the respondent No. 5 lives below the poverty line. Thus, the

(34)

order of the Collector/Additional Collector, Kabirdham is just and proper, and it does not warrant any interference.

5. Thus, the writ petition is dismissed. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
Satish K.Agnihotri
Judge

Subhash